SUBJECTS.

Stamp paper and fees would not be accepted until the original records of which copies were asked for were found; and those would not be found unless the petty subordinates of the branch were satisfied by the parties. If the parties did not dance attendance on them, the application stood the chance of being rejected after seven days. It should therefore be ruled that the originals should be found within seven days at the latest and the application for copies should not be rejected until after seven days from the date on which the originals were found. The Member said that the copying branch required the closest attention and stringent instructions. There were too many copyists in the Courts at present. He also said that proper men were not being appointed as commissioners, and he suggested that respectable clerks, who had some knowledge of survey, be appointed as commissioners and that they be directed to frame their reports in consultation with the respectable gentry of the locality.

Dewan's reply.—The representations of the Members will be communicated to the High Court.

46. The desirability of re-transferring the pakuthies of Veliyam and Velinallur from the jurisdiction of the Quilon to that of the Kottarakara Munsiff.

Mr. Devan Govindan (Member, Kottarakara taluk) said that the *pakuthies* of Veliyam and Velinallur had been within the jurisdiction of the Kottarakara Munsiff's Court, but that, in the recent re-adjustment of the territorial jurisdiction of the Courts, they were brought under the jurisdiction of the Quilon Munsiff's Court. The distances from the centres of those *pakuthies* to the Kottarakara Munsiff's Court were about 5 and 7 miles respectively, while the corresponding distances to the Quilon Munsiff's Court were 19 and 21 miles. The people of the two *pakuthies* had now to get to Kottarakara first and thence take train to Quilon. The magisterial, registration and revenue jurisdictions of the *pakuthies* were with the offices at Kottarakara. The Member therefore prayed that the civil jurisdiction of the two *pakuthies* might be re-transferred to the Kottarakara Munsiff's Court.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

47. The need for re-establishing a Munsiff's Court at Shencotta.

Mr. G Sankaranarayana Iyer (Member, T. I. C., Shencotta) said that the frontier taluk of Shencotta had a Munsiff's Court between 1010 and 1087 M. E. From 1010 to 1043 the Tahsildar-Magistrate was doing the duties of the Munsiff, from 1043 to 1072 there was a full-time Munsiff, and from 1072 to 1082 the old arrangement of the Tahsildar-Magistrate being also the Munsiff was revived. On the representation of the people, the arrangement was cancelled and a Magistrate-Munsiff was appointed in 1082, and it continued till 1087. The last arrangement worked very satisfactorily and was also economical to the Government. The Court was at present abolished and the people of Shencotta had to go to Kottarakara. The volume of inconvenience the altered arrangement caused to the Shencotta public would be seen on an examination of the number of suits of different kinds and execution petitions from Shencotta on the Kottarakara Munsiff's file. The people from the interior villages of the taluk had now to walk or come in carts for several miles, take train at Shencotta and go to Kottarakara. In several suits for small amounts, the inconvenience in going to the Court, coupled with the risk of losing the cases ultimately, made the people rest content in their houses. He requested that all the above facts might

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly